Attachment to Independent Case Review Report For CDRU # 846 Case file # 95-289507.

Material Examiner Malone (RO)

Remarks.		
		•
	···	

,	•		SE REVIEW	REPORT		
Independent Review co	onducted by:	STEVE K	OBERISON	· .		
Area(s) of Expertise: _	HAIR AND	FIREXS	·			·
Review commenced at	:/ <u>0 :3JA</u> (T	ime), <u>911</u>	14 1 59 (Date)			
File #: 95-2	89507	•				. •
Laboratory #(s):	10817016		,		٠	
9	0821070	,				
,					•	
						·
	•	Examiner(s) & Symbols		•	
RQ	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed	₫
YC		S				
				0		
Trial testimony transcri	pt(s) of:		Reviewed	. ,	· 	
Testimony Dat	1c(s): <u>Unkn</u>	യപ	Pages: 322-3	58		
Laboratory Report(s):					•	•
Laboratory Nu	mber: <u>908</u>	17016 908	721070 Date:	DEC 13,	1989	. ,
Laboratory Nu	mber:	•	Date:			
Laboratory Nu	mber:		Date:		•	
Examiner Bench Notes	of: RQA	ND UNKNOW	N TECHNICIAN			
Laboratory Nu	mber: <u>9081</u>		• .			
	mber: 9082					
Laboratory Nur						' ,
		Page(of 4 SUL			
				. <u>C</u>	RM - 142	86

Was any other material reviewed? Was any other material reviewed?	No		
If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: $\frac{\int u}{\int u}$	BMITTING	AGEN	ICY LETTERS DATED
Aug 14 AND AUG 17, 1989.			
0 0	of Reviev		
File #: 95-289507 Item or	Specimen #	Reviewed	1: <u>48-035, 644,</u>
			K 3, K4
Review of Laboratory R	onort(s) on	d Danch	•
	• , , ,		
Note: Numbered comment additional pages for any "No" or			
protocols, and analytic techniques available at the Y 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laborate bench notes?	es □ No ory report(s)	® Unai supported	ble to Determine
Review of	Testimony	<i>י</i> :	
Note: Numbered comment additional pages for any "No" or			
□ Transcript not available.		•	
3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?	Yes	□ No	□ Unable to Determine
4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?	z Yes	□ No	□ Unable to Determine
5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?	□ Yes	8 No	□ Unable to Determine
	•		·.
•	•		

Page 2 of 4
Initials SML

95-289507

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed) # 1. THE DICUMENTATION IS INSUFFICIENT TO DETERMINE IF THE
110 DECAMENTATION TO INSUFFICIENT TO DETERMINE IF THE
TESTS WERE PERFORMED IN A SCIENTIFICALLY ACCEPTABLE
MANNER.
#2. THE RESULTS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY DOCUMENTED IN THE
NOTES. THE NOTES ARE NOT DATED, SOME ARE IN PENCIL
AND DO NOT INDICATE THE NUMBER OF HAIR RECOVEREDOR
AVAILABLE FOR COMPARISON. THE TECHNICIAN DOES NOT DOCUMEN;
THAT HAIR WAS RECOVERED FROM THE Q ITEMS.
CONFIRMATION OF THE HAIR COMPARISON WAS APPARENTLY
OBTAINED FROM ANOTHER QUALIFIED (?) EXAMINER, BUT THE
CONFIRMATION SHEET DOES NOT SPECIFY WHICH 2 SPECIMENS
WELE EXAMINED, WHEN THEY WERE EXAMINED OR IF THE
Review completed at: $12:00P$ (Time), $9/14/99$ (Date)
Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): //2 hours
I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are
fully documented on this report consisting of a total of
At Valor
(Signature) (Date)
(Osgania) (Date)

Page 3 of 4

Additional Comments (Set forth by question #, if applicable)

File#: 95-289507
SECOND EXAMINER AGREED WITH THE COMPARISON.
NO DOCUMENTATION COULD BE FOUND IN THE FILE
CONCERNING THE DISCONTINUANCE OF LAB GRAMINATIONS
ON THE BLOOD/SEMEN OR LATENT PRINT EVIDENCE AS
REPORTED IN THE LAB REPORT
#5. MALONE TESTIFIED THAT BASED ON HIS EXPERIENCE, THERE IS
ONLY A I IN 5,000 CHANCE THAT THE Q19 HAIR COULD BE
SOMEBUDY ELSE'S BESIDES THE VICTIM (p. 345). THE DEFENSE
PROPERLY OBSECTED AND THE COURT SUSTAINED.
TOTERDY OF GEOTES THOSE THE SECOND TO THE SECOND THE SE

Page 4 of 4
Initials: SMA